

TWENTY-ONE
Conclusions

Further Demonstrating the
S C H I S M
OF THE
Church of England &c.

Formerly Offer'd in Confutation of Dr. *Hammond*, and
Bishop *Bramhall*.

To which are added,

Some Reasons Tender'd to impartial people, Why Dr.
H. Manice, Chancellor of his Grace of *Canterbury*, ought
not to be Traducer, or Licensor, of the Pamphlet,
entitled, *A Plain Account of a Popish Priest, Question-
ing the Obedience due to the King of England*.

Manice's



Twenty-One CONCLUSIONS Further Demonstrating the SCHISM of the Church of England, &c.

I. **T**hat (whatsoever the Extent of the Pope's Authority be, or be not, yet) 'tis clear, that all Roman-Catholicks, that is, all Communicants with the Church of Rome, or Papists, hold the substance of the Pope's Authority; that is, hold the Pope to be Supreme Ecclesiastical Governor in God's Church. This is evident from the very terms, since to acknowledg the Papal Authority is to be a Papist, or Communicant with the Church of Rome.

II. The holding or acknowledging this Authority, is to all that hold it, that is, to the whole Church of Rome, or to all those particular Church's united with Rome, a Principle of Unity in Government. This is plain likewise from the terms; since an Acknowledgment of one Supreme Governor, either in Secular or Spiritual affairs, is the Ground which establishes those Acknowledgers in submission to that one Government; that is, 'tis to them a Principle of Unity in Government.

III. 'Tis evident, That all those Churches in Communion with the Church of Rome hold firmly, that whatsoever the Living Voice of the present Church, i.e. of Pastors and Fathers of Families directed by those Pastors, shall unanimously conspire to teach and deliver to Learners and Children to have been received from their immediate Pastors and Fathers, as taught by Christ and his Apostles, is to be undoubtedly held as taught by them; i.e. that this delivery from immediate Forefathers as from theirs, as from Christ, is an infallible and certain Rule of Faith, that is, a Principle of Unity in Faith. This to be the Tenet of all particular Churches in Communion with Rome, both sides acknowledg; and it is hence evident, that the Body made up of such Churches ever cast

out from its Communion all those that did innovate against this Tenet.

IV. *'Tis manifest, that all the Churches in Communion with Rome equally held at the time of the Protestant Reformation, in K. Henry's days, these two Principles as they do now, i. e. 1. The Substance of the Pope's Authority, or that he is Supreme in God's Church; 2. That the Living Voice of the present Church, delivering as abovesaid, is the infallible Rule of Faith.* This is manifested by our Adversaries impugning those Churches, as holding Tradition and the Popes Headship; nor was it ever pretended, that either those Churches held not these Tenets then, or that they have renounc'd them since.

V. *The Church of England, immediately before the Reformation, was one of those Churches which held Communion with Rome, (as all the world grant) and consequently held with the rest the two foremention'd Tenets, prev'd to have been the Principles of Unity both in Faith and Government.*

VI. *That Body of Christians, or that Christian Commonwealth consisting of the then-Church of England and other Churches in Communion with Rome, holding Christ's Law upon the said tenure of immediate Tradition, and submitting to the Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Pope, was a true and real Church.* This is manifest by our very Adversaries acknowledgment, who grant the now Church of Rome, even without their Church, to be a true and real one, tho' holding the same Principles of Unity, both in Faith and Government, which she held when the Reformers revolted from her.

VII. *That Body consisting of the then Church of England, and her other Fellow-communicants with Rome, was united or made one by means of these two Principles of Unity.* For the undoubted acknowledgment of one common Rule of Faith to be certain, is in it's own nature apt to unite those Acknowledgers in Faith, that is, to unite them as Faithful, and consequently in all other Actions springing from Faith. And the undoubted acknowledgment of one Supreme Ecclesiastical Governor gave these Acknowledgers

an

an Ecclesiastical Unity, or Church-communion under the notion of Governed, or Subjects of an Ecclesiastical Commonwealth. Now nothing can more nearly concern a Church, than the Rules of Faith and Government, especially if the Government be of Faith, and receiv'd upon its Rule. Seeing then these two Principles gave them some Unity and Communion as *Faithful*, and as belonging to an Ecclesiastical Commonwealth, it must necessarily be Church-Unity and Communion which these two Principles gave them.

VIII. *The Protestant Reformers renounced both these Principles.* This is undeniably evident, since they left off to hold the Pope's Supreme power to act in Ecclesiastical affairs, and also to hold divers points, which the former Church immediately before the breach, had receiv'd from immediate Pastors and Fathers, as from Christ.

IX. Hence follows, *That those Reformers in renouncing these two Principles did commit the horrid fact of breaking Church-Communion, or Schismatizing.* This is demonstrably consequent from the two last Paragraphs, where 'tis proved, that those two Principles made Church-Communion, that is, caus'd Unity in that Body which themselves acknowledg'd a true Church; as also, that they renounc'd or broke those Principles; therefore they broke that which United the Church: And so broke the Unity of the Church, or Schismatiz'd.

X. *This renouncing those two Principles of Ecclesiastical Communion, prov'd to have been an actual breach of Church-Unity, was antecedent to the Pope's Excommunicating the Protestants, and his commanding Catholicks to abstain from their Communion.* This is known, and acknowledg'd by all the world; nor till they were Protestants by renouncing those Principles, could they be Excommunicated as Protestants.

XI. *This actual breach of Church-Unity in King Henry's, Edward the Sixth's, and the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, could not be imputable to the subsequent Excommunication,*

nication, as to its cause. 'Tis plain, since the Effect cannot be before the Cause.

XII. *Those subsequent Excommunications, caused not the actual Breach, or Schism between us* For the antecedent renouncing those two points, shew'n to have been the Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity, had already caused the breach, dis-union, or division between us: But, those between whom an actual division is made, are not still divisible; that is, they who are already divided are not now to be divided. Wherefore, however it may be pretended, that those Excommunications made those Congregations, who were antecedently thus divided, stand at further distance from one another; yet 'tis most senseless, and unworthy a man of reason to affirm, that they divided those who were already divided e're those Excommunications came. Especially, since the Rule of Faith, and the substance of the Pope's Authority consist in an indivisible, and are points of that nature, that the renouncing these, is a Principle of renouncing all Faith and Government. For, whoever renounces any Rule, may, nay ought, if he act consequently, renounce all he holds upon that Rule, whether points of Faith or of Government, nay even the Letter of God's Written Word it self; that is, all that Christ left us, or that can concern a Church.

XIII. *The renouncing those two Principles of the former Church-Unity, as it evidently disunited men's minds in order to Faith and Government, so, if reduced into practice, it must necessarily dis-unite or divide them likewise in External Church-carriage.* This is clear, since our Tenets are the Principles of our Actions; and so contrary Tenets of contrary carriage.

XIV. *Those tenets contrary to the two Principles of Church-Unity were de facto put in practice by the Reforming Party; and consequently they divided the Church, both internally and externally.* This is most undeniably evident; since they wrote, preach'd, and acted against the Tradition, or Delivery

very of the immediately foregoing Church, as erroneous in many points, which she deliver'd to them as from immediate Fathers, and so upwards as from Christ; and proceeded now to interpret Scripture by another Rule than by the Tenets and Practice of that immediately foregoing Church. And as for the former Government, they absolutely renounc'd its influence in *England*, preach'd and wrote against it: Na. kept Congregations apart before they had got the power in their hands, and, after they had the power in their hands, punish'd and put to Death (and that upon account of Religion) many of the maintainers of those two Principles of Church-Unity.

XV. *Hence follows, That the Protestant Breach was a perfect and compleat Fact of Schism.* For it divided the former Ecclesiastical Body both internally and externally, and that as it was an *Ecclesiastical* Body, since it violated those two Principles which concern'd *Ecclesiastical* Unity.

XVI. *The subsequent Excommunication of our Church was therefore due, fitting, and necessary.* Due; for it is as due a carriage towards those who have actually renounc'd the Principles of Unity both in Faith and Government, and so broken Church-Unity, to be Excommunicated by that Body from which those Renouncer's thus broke, as it is towards Rebels, who have renounc'd both Supreme Government and Fundamental Laws of a Commonwealth, and so divided the Temporal Body, to be denounced and proclaimed Rebels by the same Commonwealth. *Fitting*, since the effect of it they most resent, which was to keep the true Faithful apart in Ecclesiastical actions from them, signified no more than this, that they who had broken both internally and externally from the former Body should not be treated with, in Ecclesiastical matters, as still of it, nor be own'd for parts of that Commonwealth of which already they had made themselves no parts. Lastly, *Necessary*; All Government and good order going to wrack, if opposite parties be allow'd to treat together

commonly in such actions in which their opposition must necessarily and frequently discover it self; which will inevitably disgust the more prudent sort, hazard to pervert the weaker, and breed disquiet on both sides.

Thus far to evidence demonstrably, that the external fact of Schism was truly theirs; which done, tho it be needless to add any more to prove them formal Schismatics, themselves confessing that such a fact cannot be justifiable by any reasons or motives whatsoever [*Sch. c. 1.*] Yet I shall not depend upon their standing to their own words, knowing how easie a thing it is, for men who talk loosely, and not with strict rigor of Discourse, to shuffle off their own sayings: I shall therefore prosecute my own method, and alledg, That

XVII. *The very doing an external fact, of so bainous a nature as is breaking Church-Unity, concludes a Guilt in the Actors, unless they render reasons truly sufficient to excuse their fact.* This is evident, *a fortiori*, by paralleling this to facts of inferior malice: For, whosoever rises against a long settled and acknowledg'd Temporal Power, is concluded by that very fact of rising to be a Rebel, unless he render sufficient reasons for it: Otherwise, till those reasons appear, the Good of Peace, Order, and Unity, which he evidently violates by his rising, concludes him most irrational and sinful.

XVIII. *No reasons can be sufficient to excuse such a fact, but such as are able to convince, that 'twas better to do that fact, than not to do it.* This is most evident.

XIX. *In this case, where the point is demonstrable, and of highest concern, no reason merely probable can convince the Understanding, that the contrary was better to be done, but only a manifest and rigorous demonstration.* For, tho in the common sort of human actions, an high Probability that the thing is in it self better, be sufficient for action, yet there are some things of a nature so manifest to all Mankind to be univversally good, that nothing but rigorous

Evidence can be pretended a ground sufficient to oppose them. For example, that *Parents are to be honour'd, that Government is to be in the World, that Unity of Government is to be kept up in God's Church, that there ought to be certain Grounds for Faith, &c.* Which, since on the one side they are such as are in their own nature demonstrable, and indeed self-evident, and on the other so universally beneficial, and consequently an universal harm, or rather a deluge of inconveniences & mischief would break in if the Actor against these should happen to be in the wrong; He is therefore bound in these cases not to act till he sees the utmost that is to be seen concerning such affairs: But affairs of this nature are demonstrable, or rather self-evident (as is said) on the one side, therefore he ought not to act, unless he could see perfect demonstration, that 'tis better for him to act otherwise: Wherefore, it having been manifestly prov'd, that this Fact of theirs left neither *Certain Ground of Faith*, nor *Unity of Government* in God's Church, nothing but a perfect and rigorous demonstration could be able to convince the Understanding, that 'twas better to act.

XX. *The Protestants produce no such demonstration, that 'twas better to act in this case.* For, they never clos'd with severe demonstration, in any of their Writings I have yet seen, to evidence rigorously either, That the Rule of immediate Delivery was not *certain*, or that the Pope had no Supreme Authority in Ecclesiastical affairs, or lastly, that the Pope's Authority was to be abolisht for the *Abuses* sake: Which were necessary to be done, ere they could demonstrate it better to break Church-Unity. Nor does their manner of writing bear the slenderest resemblance of rigorous demonstration: Since demonstration is not a connecting of Air and Words, but of Notions and Sense; and this from self-evident Principles even to the very intended Conclusion. Whereas their way of Writing is only to find out the Sense of

Words by a kind of Dictionary-manner; which sort of Discourse is the most fallible, sleight, and subject to Equivocation, that can be imagin'd. To omit, that rigorous Demonstration is pretended by our Party for the proof of our Rule of Faith, *viz.* immediate Tradition, which they renounc'd; and consequently for the proof of whatsoever was receiv'd upon it (as was the Pope's Authority) as yet unanswer'd by their side. Nay their own side sometimes acknowledg our said Rule of Faith infallible; even Dr. *Hammond* himself, who affirms, that Universal Attestation makes one as certain of a thing, as if he had seen it with his own eyes.

XI. *'Tis the most absurd and impious folly imaginable, to bring for their excuse, That they were fully persuaded the thing was to be done, or is to be continued.* For, since a full persuasion may spring from Passion or Vice, as well as from Reason and Virtue, it signifies nothing, in order to an excuse, to say one was fully persuaded he was to do such a thing, till he shew whence he became thus persuaded; otherwise his persuasion might be a fault in itself, and the occasion of his other fault in thus acting. 'Tis not therefore his Perswasion, but the Ground of his Perswasion, which is to be alledged, and lookt into. Which, if it were Reason, whence he came thus persuaded, and that he knew how he came to be persuaded (without knowing which, 'twas irrational to be persuaded at all) then he can render us this reason which persuaded him; and reason telling us evidently, that no reason less than demonstration is in our case able to breed full persuasion or conviction, that it was *better to act* (as hath been prov'd *Conc.* 19.) It follows, they must give us a demonstrative reason, why 'twas better to be done, otherwise they can never justify that persuasion, much less the fact which issued from it: But the fact being evidently enormous, and against a present Order of highest concern, and no truly evident reason appearing, why 'twas bet-
ter

ter to do that fact, 'tis from it self convinc'd, and concluded irrational, precipitate, and vicious. If they complain of this doctrine, as too rigorous in leaving no excuse for weak and ignorant persons, who act out of simplicity: I reply, either their first Reformers, and themselves the continuers of the Breach, thought themselves ignorant of those things they went about to reform, or no. If they thought themselves ignorant, and yet attempted to make themselves Judges, 'tis a plain self-condemnation and irrational. If they were ignorant, or in some degree ignorant, or in some degree less ignorant; then I ask, what made them think themselves wiser than they were, except their own Pride: So that which way soever they turn, their fault and guilt pursue them. But, if they were indeed knowing in those things, then 'tis apparent there are no truly sufficient, convincing, or demonstrative reasons to be given why they acted, since they were never able to produce any such, tho' urg'd and oblig'd thereunto by the highest motives imaginable. Whence they remain still criminal as in the former cases, and indeed much more, leaving it manifest, that neither perswasion, nor their fact which was originiz'd from it, sprung from Reason in their Understanding, but from Passion and Affection in their Will.

Therefore the Protestants are Guilty both of Material and Formal Schism; since 'tis evident, they have done both a Schismatical Fact, and out of a Schismatical Affection.

Some Reasons tender'd to impartial persons, why Dr. H. Maurice, Chaplain to his Grace of Canterbury, ought not to be Traduc'd as the Licenſer of the Pamphlet, entituled, A Plain Answer to a Popiſh Prieſt, Queſtioning the Orders of the Church of England.

1. **D**R. H. Maurice is not that weak, illiterate Man, as to let paſs with his *Imprimatur*, ſuch a forg'd imputation, as I find in the 5th and 6th Line; *Our (Church of England) Ordainers are Schiſmaticks, or Hereticks, and ſo cannot Ordain.* Forg'd, I ſay, becauſe the Pamphlet ſays, this *uſeth* to be objected; whereas it is moſt notoriously falſe, That Ordination from a Schiſmatick or Heretick is invalid; and equally falſe, that *Papiſts* argue from the Schiſm or Hereſie of the Ordainer, that the power of Conſecrating Orders is null: And conſequently, it is not the *Papiſts* objection, but a meer fiction, that this *hard forehead* preſumes to obtrude upon us, as approv'd by Dr. Maurice.

2. Dr. Maurice knows, that *Lambeth-Ordination*, as to the matter of fact, depends on the Veracity of Dr. Parker; and if Dr. Parker was ſo upright a man, as never to have forg'd or corrupted Records, (which I hear the *Papiſts* pretend to prove) the *Nags-head-Ordination* will require a very ſtrong aſſurance to out-face Dr. Parker's Record. But that his Ordainers were Three, nay more than Three true Biſhops, is ſuch a great point, that the *Papiſts* muſt eternally be dumb, if this can be made out; and therefore it would be kindly taken, if an Authentick Record were produc'd to prove they were all, or any of them ſo. And whereas in the Archives of *Canterbury* Dr. Maurice cannot find any ſuch Record, he could not ſuppoſe this Pamphleteer reſponſible for any ſuch.

3. All know, That as to the Succession in Doctrine, the *Arians* had it not, tho they pleaded Belief of all Necessaries to Salvation believ'd so before *Nice*; and the *Papists* say, the *Protestants* Plea and Belief is no better, whilst they submit not to the Decisions of *Trent*. So that Succession in Doctrine is a Disputable point; and Dr. *Maurice* has more judgment than to approve what is boldly said, not prov'd at all.

4. If then it be uncertain (for *Infallibility* the Church of *England* pretends not to), whether *Protestants* have that Succession of Doctrine, (the Pamphlet proves it not, but only says *we have*), it should have been prov'd, that at least they have Succession of Persons to shew, who have all along had true Orders, and conferr'd them on other Ordainers till these times. The Pamphlet says so in these words, *We have had such a Succession from the very foundation of our Church*. But neither tells us whence he times this foundation of his Church, nor troubles himself to prove this Succession, otherwise than by saying it is not necessary to shew it. It will not easily be believ'd, that Dr. *Maurice* cannot distinguish betwixt saying and proving, or that he approv'd the Paper which does so.

5. If those *Western* Fathers prove Innovation upon Hereticks, because they wanted true Succession from the Apostles; and by instancing in the Succession of the Church of *Rome*, prove evidently they meant Succession of Persons; then certainly *Ants* must endeavour to answer better than they, lest they seem to be only *Yesterday-men*; and if their Plea of Believing all Necessaries to Salvation, or Succession of Doctrine, excus'd them not; and if Succession of Persons not shew'n, convinc'd them of Novelty, something more *Protestants* must have to say, than that it is not necessary to shew any. And since this man does not, and thence gives occasion to *Papists* to think it cannot be done, I must not think Dr. *Maurice* would concur to expose his Church.

6. He approves not that Aphorism, *None can confer that Power on another, which he hath not himself*: Because if it were true, an *Infidel* could not give Baptism, because ~~not Baptized~~. Truly I do not see how this follows, tho' that Aphorism be generally true. For, if Baptism be not the power of Baptizing, then surely one not Baptized may have the power of Baptizing; and if he exercises this power, he does not confer a power on another which he has not himself. I fear this man, by this *Innuendo* would dispose us to believe, that their Bishops had their Orders as validly from Laymen's, as others may in case of necessity have Baptism from the hands of Infidels. It is what *Savage* allows to the disgrace of his new Church, but I must not believe Dr. *Maurice* did.

7. He says, That Christ instituted no Form of words; he says so, and that is his proof. Now to use some of his own terms, I would be glad to meet that man who could evidently prove to me, 1. That Christ instituted no Form of Words. 2. Deliver'd not the *holy Vessels* to the *Apostles*. 3. Gave them no power to Offer Sacrifice for the Quick and the Dead. Proving is more than saying; he did not.

8. The Title says He (the Pamphleteer) is a Minister of the Church of *England*; and so we should believe him a Divine; and if the consequence were good, No Divine, no Minister; it would be visible enough that he sham'd us in the Title, For here comes *Imposition of Hands* to be the Form of Orders. *Risum reventis Theologi*. Nay the *Roman Church* allows it (*Imposition of Hands*) to be a sufficient Form; nay the *Grecian* too, &c. Antiquity, St. *Chrysostom*, whereas the *Romish Form* of touching the *Vessels* is younger by 800 years than our Saviour's time. Assuredly Dr. *Maurice* knows how to distinguish Matter and Form, which this poor man does not. And whilst *Papists* charge Protestants to have no true Form, to answer they have a true Form, and then prove they have true Matter, and miscall it Form,

Form, is not to answer them, but betray the Protestants; and I must not believe Dr. *Maurice* concern'd in it.

9. His Answer to the third Objection is impertinent, because it answers not any *Papish* Objection, as you see in the beginning, but only his own fiction. Indeed I observe the kindness of this man to his Mother Church; he will suppose her Bishops Schismatical and Heretical, and then defend the validity of her Ordination by the validity of *Laymen's Baptism*, and such-like cases; which is the second *Innuendo*, that as Laymen may validly Baptize, so they may validly Ordain Bishops. Certainly Dr. *Maurice* would never approve this.

If Ordination of Hereticks be valid, as he allows here, then Succession of Persons, is sufficient without Succession of Doctrine, which he allows not before. But this man's Truth is like his Logick. *Greeks* sent from the Seminary at *Rome* to be Ordained by Heretical Bishops in the *East*! I believe he has no Authentick Record for this neither.

10. I conclude then, That this man's Intention is not to defend, but expose Protestant-Orders; and what he concludes with concerning the assurance of the validity of their Orders, because they require not the Intention of the Ordainer, squints suspiciously towards the *Nags-head Tavern*, as tho their first pretended Bishops intending to be merry there, laid their Hands upon one another, without intending any more, and that any one may do as much for his Neighbour, and as validly too, when he intends nothing less; and that such only is the assurance of the validity of their Orders: and that such is the Opinion too of Dr. *H. Maurice*, the Respect given to his Learning and his Character will not allow me to believe.